DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 060 HE 007 914

TITLE	The University in Society: An Inter-American Dialogue.
INSTITUTION	Institute of International Education, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	55p.; Report of the CHEAR Conference, Caracas, Venezuela (March 3-8, 1974)
AVAILABLE FROM	Institute of International Education, 809 United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017 (free)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Developing Nations; Educational Coordination; Foreign Countries; Foreign Relations; *Higher Education; International Relations; Latin American Culture; *Political Influences; *Technical Assistance; Technological Advancement; *Universities

ABSTRACT

The CHEAR conference was designed to promote a regular exchange of ideas and information among educational leaders in the Western Hemisphere. The agenda focused on three issues: interrelationships among education, development and modernization; interactions between government policy and higher education; and needs and institutional responses in the broad area of intellectual, educational and cultural exchange. The essay is a collection of the views expressed and deals with such topics as conceptions of the role of the U.S. university; conceptions of the role of the Latin American university; comparative roles of the two; the authority system in each; the political roles of the U.S. and Latin American university; the role of the university in modernization; and mutual cooperation in international development. Specific recommendations that emerged from the conference were for technical assistance through educational exchange; improved inter-American communication; and Latin American integration. (JMF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED124060

The University in Society:

An Inter-American Dialogue

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Institute of International Education

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 007 914

IIE

Institute of International Education

PREVIOUS PUBLICATIONS IN THIS SERIES

The Arts and the University (1964)

National Development and the University (1965)

Agriculture and the University (1965)

Educational Technology and the University (1969)

Demography and the University: The State of Population Studies in Latin America (1969)

Student Activism and Higher Education: An Inter-American Dialogue (1970)

Education for Journalism in Latin America (1971)

Communications Technology and the Crisis in Education: A Report on the Bahia Workshop (1971)

© 1974 by Institute of International Education.
All rights reserved.

ISBN 0-87206-069-1

Table of Contents

vii Preface

ix Participants

xiii Introduction

1 Conceptions of the Role of the U.S. University

5 Conceptions of the Role of the Latin American University

9 Comparative Roles of U.S. and Latin American Universities

13 The Authority System in U.S. and Latin American Universities

21 The Political Role of the U.S. University

23 The Political Role of the Latin American University

27 The Role of the University in Modernization

35 Mutual Cooperation in International Development

41 Conference Recommendations

45 Footnotes

This is a report on the 1974 CHEAR Conference held in Caracas, Venezuela. IIE acknowledges with thanks a grant from the Tinker Foundation of New York which made the Conference possible. We also thank the Creole Foundation of Caracas and Corporación Venezolana de Guayana (CVG) for supplemental assistance.

Preface

The 1974 CHEAR Conference held in Caracas, Venezuela, from March 3 – 8 was the sixteenth in a series of meetings designed to promote a regular exchange of ideas and information among educational leaders in the Western Hemisphere.

As in the past, the 1974 Conference reflected a conviction that frank and free communication among educators of this hemisphere is of significant value in its own right. Emphasis was placed on informal dialogue in an atmosphere free of the constraints usually associated with international meetings. CHEAR participants are invited as individuals and are not expected to represent either their institutions or their countries in any formal or official capacity.

A number of new emphases emerged at the Caracas meetings. Among them was an effort to relate the CHEAR forum more directly to the work of IIE as a whole. The Caracas Conference generated valuable insights on the increasingly complex interactions between higher education, development and modernization, and on the consequent shifts in the role played by educational and cultural exchange programs in furthering development goals. The special problems and opportunities presented by intellectual interchange in the Americas continue to be important aspects of the broad topic of higher education and development. IIE acquired much useful knowledge and direction in the planning of new programs from the concepts generated by the CHEAR forum.

The Caracas Conference differed from its predecessors in another important respect. In the past, participation usually was limited to university presidents and rectors. This year several

professional specialists were invited. The mix of academic administrators and specialists in professional fields proved useful in provoking lively and fruitful examination of the issues.

The conference agenda focused on three issues: interrelationships among education, development and modernization; interactions between government policy and higher education; and needs and institutional responses in the broad area of intellectual, educational and cultural exchange. The report which follows highlights these principal issues and attempts to provide a sense of the collective contribution of the participants to an examination of them. It is not a summary record of deliberations, but rather an essay which organizes the points of view expressed by the participants in a logical relationship to each other. The initial draft was prepared by the conference rapporteur, Professor Noel F. McGinn of the Center for Studies in Education and Development at Harvard University. The final report is the product of close collaboration between Mr. McGinn and myself. Every effort was made to produce an accurate interpretation of the Caracas discussions; we accept responsibility for any mistakes in fact or misrepresentations of viewpoint which may have crept in unnoticed.

We wish to extend our thanks to the Tinker Foundation of New York, whose generous grant to the Institute of International Education provided the bulk of the funding for the conference. Miss Martha T. Muse, the Foundation's president and executive director, was an active participant in our deliberations. We also wish to thank the Creole Foundation of Caracas for its grant to cover a number of local expenses in Venezuela and for its assistance with a variety of local arrangements. Finally, we appreciate the help of the Corporación Venezolana de Guayana (CVG) in making possible a visit by the conference participants to see at first hand the industrial plant and the experimental educational projects which have made the Guayana project a model for imaginative industrial development, urban planning and educational experimentation.

James F. Tierney
New York, New York
July, 1974

Participants

Eduardo Aldana Valdes
Rector
Universidad de Los Andes
Bogotá, D. E., Colombia

Guido Arnal
Acting Rector
Universidad Católica Andrés Bello
Caracas, Venezuela

Werner A. Baum
Chancellor
University of Wisconsin
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Edward J. Bloustein
President
Rutgers University
The State University of New Jersey
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Edgardo Boeninger K.
Former Rector
Universidad de Chile
Santiago, Chile

Roberto Bravo Garzón
Rector
Universidad de Veracruz
Jalapa, Mexico

Reynold E. Carlson
Regional Program Advisor
The Ford Foundation
Lima, Perú

Dale R. Corson
President
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Wallace B. Edgerton
President
Institute of International Education
New York, New York

Harold L. Enarson
President
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Alberto Escobar S.
Professor of Linguistics
Universidad Nacional Mayor
de San Marcos
Lima, Perú
and
Foreign Curriculum Consultant
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico

Robben W. Fleming
President
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Ismael Ghanem
President
Ain-Shams University
Cairo, Egypt

Eduardo González Reyes
Director
Oficina de Planeamiento del Sector Universitario
Caracas, Venezuela

George Hall
President
The Creole Foundation
Caracas, Venezuela

Luis Felipe Hartmann
Rector
Universidad Mayor de San Andrés
La Paz, Bolivia

Philip G. Hoffman
President
University of Houston
Houston, Texas

Blas Lamberti
Rector
Universidad Metropolitana
Caracas, Venezuela

Alberto Leon-Betancourt
Rector
Universidad del Valle
Cali, Colombia

Duncan Livingston
Programa Internacional de Intercambio Educativo
Santiago, Chile

Robert B. Mautz
Chancellor
The State University System of Florida
Tallahassee, Florida

Ernesto Mayz Vallenilla
Rector
Universidad Simon Bolivar
Caracas, Venezuela

Candido Mendes
Presidente
Sociedade Brasileira de Instrucão
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Eugenio Mendoza
Presidente
Fundación Eugenio Mendoza
Caracas, Venezuela

Martin Meyerson
President
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Emilio F. Mignone
Rector
Universidad Nacional de Luján
Luján, Argentina

Mohamed Mursi Ahmed
Secretary General
Association of Arab Universities
Cairo, Egypt

Martha T. Muse
President
The Tinker Foundation
New York, New York

Rafael José Neri
Rector
Universidad Central de Venezuela
Caracas, Venezuela

Luis Manuel Peñalver
Asesor
Universidad Simon Bolivar
Caracas, Venezuela

John P. Schaefer
President
The University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

Ernesto Schiefelbein
Programa Regional del Empleo para America Latina y El Caribe
Organizacion Internacional del Trabajo
Santiago, Chile

John R. Silber
President
Boston University
Boston, Massachusetts

Kalman H. Silvert
Professor of Politics
New York University
New York, New York

Heitor Gurgulino de Souza
Director
Department of University Affairs
Ministry of Education
Brasilia, D.F., Brazil

Stephen H. Spurr
President
The University of Texas
Austin, Texas

Henry King Stanford
President
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida

James F. Tierney
Vice President
Institute of International Education
New York, New York

Victor L. Urquidi
Presidente
El Colegio de Mexico
Mexico, D.F.

F. Champion Ward
International Division
The Ford Foundation
New York, New York

OBSERVERS

Gary S. Kozak
Manager
Education and Scientific Relations
IBM World Trade Corporation
New York, New York

Cassandra Pyle
IIE Overseas Director
for South America
Chicago, Illinois

Hector Font Viale-Rigo
Gerente
Corporación Venezolana de Guayana
Caracas, Venezuela

RAPPORTEUR

Noel F. McGinn
Center for Studies in Education
and Development
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

STAFF

Mary Alice Price
Program Assistant
Institute of International Education
New York, New York

Introduction

The 1970's in the United States and Latin America have witnessed even more turmoil and change than the 1960's, bringing university presidents and rectors a fresh set of problems. In the U.S. concern has shifted away from student disturbances and issues such as the stance the universities should take with respect to pressing domestic and foreign policy questions. Many U.S. presidents now must face threats to the financial viability of their institutions. Increased public expenditure in higher education, especially in community or junior colleges, has resulted in an overall decline in enrollments in private colleges and universities, and a leveling-off of enrollments in public four-year institutions. The federal government, state legislatures and private donors have all shown less enthusiasm for increased support for the university, while educational costs are increasing even more rapidly than the overall inflation rate.

A number of the Latin American countries have experienced severe political crises in which the universities have been centrally involved. In some countries a new wave of populism demands that university education be made available to all, while in others strong governments attempt to take over university management

to fit it to their conception of national development needs.

In both Latin America and the United States planners and development experts appear to have lost their former confidence in the ability of education to contribute to the solution of problems of poverty, social disintegration, and inequality. Educators are told that higher education is too expensive, that it is irrelevant to today's world, and that it needs to be drastically changed.

Distracted by these overwhelming problems, university leaders on both continents have had little or no time to maintain what little knowledge they may have had of the structure and activities of their colleagues in other countries. There would appear to be few ways in which educators from the United States and Latin America can learn about each other, except for conferences such as those convened by CHEAR. Differences in language make it unlikely that busy university administrators will read articles or books published in other regions. There has been relatively little attention to higher education in Latin America by scholars from U.S. universities apart from studies on student political movements. Most of the titles listed in the bibliography compiled by Altbach in 1970 are in Spanish;[1] Mayhew's 1971 review of the literature of higher education mentions no books on higher education in Latin America, and the 1972 edition lists only one.[2] The best single work in English on higher education in the Americas is still Benjamin's, which was published in 1965.[3] While there are several excellent books in Spanish or Portuguese on the concept of higher education (e.g., Ribeiro, Medina Echevarria), there are none describing national university systems.[4] There are no books orginally written in Spanish or Portuguese on higher education in the U.S., and Latin American journal articles on U.S. higher education are rare.

A chronic condition of insufficient information has been aggravated by the rapid pace of change in university and national political affairs in all countries. The problem is exacerbated by rapid shifts in the world economic and political system. International inflation, contamination of the environment and the sea, the energy crisis and the threat of world food shortages have generated some fundamental realignments in the relative power positions of the world's nations, and in thinking about the objectives of international relationships.

The 1973 CHEAR Conference revealed some of the changes in thought that have taken place among university leaders, as well as the problem of lack of information that has arisen. One of the participants stated at the opening session that the Conference would be a success if the boundaries of ignorance were at least described. He was sure, however, that no far-reaching conclusions could be expected, that the Conference would be useful to the extent that one did not assume it would produce universal answers.

Growth in Higher Education in Latin America

The presidents of the U.S. universities seemed most impressed by the information they received on the growth of higher education in Latin America. There are now an estimated 600 universities in Latin America, a striking number considering prevalent stereotypes of the relative underdevelopment of higher education. The number of universities is probably exaggerated, as many institutions assume the name even though they are in fact only one school or faculty and, in some cases, even though most of their instruction is at the secondary level.

It is certain, however, that post-secondary education has been growing just as rapidly in Latin America as in the rest of the world. In proportional terms, this growth exceeds the phenomenal development of post-secondary education experienced by the United States in the 1960's. Table 1 presents enrollment figures for the years 1960, 1965 and 1970 for the 20 Latin American republics and the U.S. In several countries enrollments in post-secondary institutions have increased by a factor of 4 or more. For example, enrollment in Brazil has expanded from less than 100,000 to more than 400,000 students in ten years. The Brazilian educators at the Conference indicated that the rate of expansion in the next ten years would be about the same as in the last decade, at which time Brazil would have more than a million students enrolled in higher education. Overall enrollments in Latin America tripled during 1960-70, while in the United States they increased by a factor of 2.3. Much of the expansion in the U.S. has been in two-year institutions, a form of higher education that has not yet found much favor in Latin America.

TABLE 1

Growth of Enrollments in Higher Education 1960-1970

	1960	*1965*	*1970*
Argentina	180,796	246,680	274,634
Bolivia	12,055	16,912	27,352
Brazil	95,691	155,781	430,473
Chile	25,452	43,608	78,430
Colombia	22,660	43,254	85,339
Costa Rica	4,703	7,229	15,400
Cuba	19,920	25,014	25,898
Dominican Republic	3,408	6,606	19,366
Ecuador	9,361	15,395	31,921
Guatemala	5,229	7,763	15,609
Mexico	78,599	133,406	247,637
Paraguay	3,425	5,833	8,172
Peru	30,983	79,259	124,700
Uruguay	15,433	17,087	18,650
Venezuela	26,477	46,325	74,666
Other Central American and Caribbean*	11,234	18,366	30,442
TOTAL LATIN AMERICA	525,426	868,518	1,508,689
UNITED STATES	3,582,726	5,526,325	8,498,117

*El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Haiti

Source: United Nations Statistical Yearkbook, 1972.

1 Conceptions of the Role of the U.S. University

The Latin American rectors in turn were impressed by the diversity of perspectives on the role of the university in the United States. A given institution, of course, may identify as valid more than one of the conceptions of the role of the university described below. However, it seems useful to characterize the major viewpoints under three rubrics:

The University as Accountable to the Public

One university president argued, perhaps to play the role of Devil's Advocate, that inasmuch as the university belongs to the people of a state, the state legislature and the governor as the citizenry's representatives should determine the goals of the university. This position seemed so extreme to some of the U.S. presidents as almost to be a caricature. However, it was clear from the discussion that several of the presidents do feel that the university should respond to social and economic needs as those needs are defined by the public and their representatives. Publicly financed U.S. primary and secondary schools reflect community needs for—and conceptions of—education. It was argued that the

community should have a similar influence on higher education. As an example of the desirable parameters of public control over university objectives, one president indicated that he would expect state government officials to make the decision with respect to whether or not a new graduate school should be located in his university. However, he and his faculty would expect to retain the right to make decisions in regard to the operation of that graduate school.

Supporters of the position that the public should determine the goals of the university argued that public institutions of higher education should not be directed by a centralized state bureaucracy, nor should they be so professionalized as to be free of any external control. The ideal control mechanism would reflect a real accountability to the public, perhaps tied to annual budget requests, although in some circumstances participation through such policy-making groups as a publicly-chosen Board of Regents or Trustees works well. Given this conception of the university, the president may be defined as a member of the state government with responsibilities similar to those of other public officials.

The University as Autonomous Political Actor

Reaction to the above perspective among other U.S. presidents was strong. Many thought that the university must act autonomously in U.S. society, in the belief that the contribution to society of a university could be properly evaluated only by the institution itself. These university presidents believe that competition with other universities, both public and private, acts as one control mechanism. Higher education also competes with other sectors in society for its share of the public fisc, providing the public with an opportunity to determine whether it is well-served or not. Public agencies, however, should not have direct control over university policy.

Because of its size and social role, the university generates its own constituency. This constituency includes alumni and faculty members. Even more significantly, it encompasses the other sectors of society that benefit from the university's prosperity and that use the university products of trained manpower and knowledge. This includes (but is not limited to) the military-industrial complex and the local business and civic groups that rely

on the university. The large payroll of the university, and its often impressive capital budget, make allies among organizations that provide services to the university, such as architectural firms, contractors and suppliers. The support of these various entities can be mobilized to improve the university's position with legislators and the state governor.

Some university presidents asserted that the university must act as an autonomous political agent in the legislature and in the community if it is to continue to serve society well. These presidents reported that much of their time was spent with legislators, the governor and other important political figures. In recent years the most serious threats to university autonomy have been efforts by state governments to make universities directly accountable to them. The presidents complained that program budgeting, with its emphasis on development of measurable output criteria, has been used by legislators and governors to impose their notions of what the university should be. Only by assuming an active political role has it been possible for universities to maintain their identity in a corporate society.

The University as a Moral Force

A third definition of the role of the university also asserted the value of higher education as an autonomous force in competition with other sectors of society. In this view the issue is less one of scarce resources and more one of the university's role in terms of social and cultural development. Other sectors of society, such as business and the mass media it controls, were described as essentially corrupting in that they draw society away from transcendental and collective goals toward selfish purposes. The university's function was stated to be the creation and propagation of moral values around which to organize social effort. This function is accomplished through the socialization of youth, but also through the active engagement of the university in public affairs.

The political model assigns the president the role of lobbyist for his or her institution; enhancement of the university is the principal goal. The moral model suggests instead that the university should actively attempt to change society. This can be accomplished by taking positions on foreign policy, military

activities, economic development goals, television broadcasting, and other public issues, as well as by committing university resources to the direct solution of pressing extra-university problems. Given the weakened authority of the Church and the debilitation of the family, it was argued that the university remains the only powerful moral force in U.S. society. The university president's role is to channel and apply that force.

The three characterizations of university roles outlined above are drawn in extreme to highlight their differences. A university may emphasize each of these roles at different times, according to circumstances and the attitudes of the university leadership. However, an exaggeration of differences among varying conceptions of the university in the U.S. may be of value in developing a better understanding of the differences and similarities between U.S. and Latin American universities.

The "dimensions" of action that appear to underlie these categories are: the degree to which the university acts on society in a proactive fashion; and the degree to which the university's activities respond to criteria intrinsic to the university or developed external to it. The following fourfold table is a graphic simplification of these types of universities. We have discussed above the Public Service type, the Corporate Political Actor type, and the type of university that seeks to act as a Moral Force in society.

A Categorical System for U.S. Universities

		Proactive Involvement in Society	
		Low	*High*
Locus of Criteria for Content of Activity	*External*	Public Service	Corporate Political Actor
	Internal		Moral Force

The fourth empty cell might be characterized as the University as Ivory Tower, not attempting to change society and basing its activities on internal rather than external criteria. None of the U.S. university presidents at the Conference represented institutions that could be considered as predominantly Ivory Tower in their orientation, but such universities do exist in the United States. St. John's College in Maryland is a classic example.

2 Conceptions of the Role of the Latin American University

Descriptions of the actions and policies of their institutions by the Latin American rectors suggested that a similar kind of descriptive system could be built to characterize universities in Latin America. The description that follows here is similar to conceptual schemes developed by Luis Scherz.[5] The first dimension of the categorical system distinguishes between institutions in terms of whether they are controlled by groups outside the university (even though the university may be autonomous in principle), or whether they operate autochthonously within the larger society. The second dimension distinguishes between institutions that seek to reproduce society and those that seek to change it. Once again we can represent these two dimensions in a fourfold table.

A Categorical System for Latin American Universities

		Tend to Reproduce Society	
		Yes	*No*
Source of Political and Ideational Control	*External*	Technocratic	Militant
	Internal		Critical Conscience

The Technocratic University

The Technocratic University organizes its activities in response to the needs of society, but these needs are defined by the present set of leaders and therefore tend to reproduce the existing social structure. Included in this category are all those universities that develop curricula in response to manpower planning done by national development planners. The university is one among several of the institutions society needs to generate the manpower and knowledge necessary to solve its problems.

The Militant University

The Militant University is also controlled by groups outside the university, in the sense that the student-faculty-administration coalition that takes over the institution and directs its energies toward the radical restructuring of society adheres to ideological positions developed by political groups outside the university. A university becomes militant as increasing politicization results in an organization of the university community along national political party lines. The process involves the intrusion of ideological concepts and political forces developed independent of the intellectual existence of the university.

The University as Critical Conscience

The University as Critical Conscience develops from attempts to respond positively to increased political awareness in the university community by organizing and directing political activism according to ideas and concepts unique to the university as community. In this model the university, as the intellectual vanguard of the nation, is seen to have special competencies that justify its totally autonomous participation in the political life of the country. Intrusion of political parties into university activities eliminates the special intellectual competency of the university as surely as does the determination of curriculum according to national manpower needs by planners outside the university.

All of the Latin American universities represented at the Conference could be included in one or more of these three categories. It is not clear what the fourth cell might include. It seems likely that at the moment in Latin America there are very

few universities that are internally controlled and not actively involved in society. One of the consequences of politicization of the Latin American university has been the location in some countries of basic research units outside of university control. Where "ivory towers" do exist, therefore, they are less likely to be associated with universities than is the case in the United States.

3 Comparative Roles of U.S. and Latin American Universities

The fact that there are *some* similarities between the kinds of universities in the United States and Latin America was the subject of comment at the Conference. It is also possible that these similarities mask fundamental differences and were therefore the source of some of the difficulties in communication experienced during the meetings. The following remarks highlight those differences.

The Technocratic University found in some Latin American countries has similarities with the Public Service University in the U.S., but there are also critical differences. The Technocratic University is generally found in countries in which economic activities have not yet reached a high degree of differentiation, in which national economic planning is carried out by a central planning agency, and in which the stage of development of the nation appears to require highly trained professionals in a relatively small number of categories.

The Public Service University in the United States, on the other hand, is a response to a pluralistic society in which the government attempts to allocate resources to a wide variety of groups at varying levels of professionalization. Given the current

stage of economic development of the United States, the university now not only trains high-level manpower but is being called upon to provide elementary technical training. Provision of universal access to higher education is seen as a means of redressing economic injustices associated with racial, sex-based, and ethnic discrimination in prior years. In some states higher education is being organized to serve as the base for programs of continuing education for adults denied higher education in their youth. Curricular programs to serve these various objectives include not only job-related training but also basic cultural formation and leisure education. These programs might well be reproductive of the existing social structure in the sense used to describe the Technocratic University in Latin America, but it is clear that they are not intended to favor directly only a small sector of the population.

For a brief period during the late 1960's, several U.S. universities looked as though they might become militant in the sense applied to Latin American universities. But for whatever reason one wants to ascribe to the demise of student activism in the United States, it is clear that university militancy at the moment is not characteristic of U.S. institutions. There are, however, a number of universities both public and private that fall into the category of Corporate Political Actor.

There are two major differences between the Militant University and the University as Corporate Political Actor. The first is that the Militant University denies the legitimacy of the established political system and therefore does not always engage in political activities considered acceptable by society. In contrast, the Political University in the United States accepts the system as is, and attempts to better its position or influence the operation of society by working from within. The second distinction is in terms of who participates in the university as a political system. In the Militant University students and faculty (and sometimes just students) exercise control and attempt to use the institution to influence society. In the U.S. university, however, political representation of the university and its interests has traditionally been limited to the president and his staff. Faculty seldom if ever have had a public role and students almost never. The president's role has been more like that of an executive of a hierarchical organization than leader of an academic community.

The student-based disturbances of the late 1960's did result in some important changes in these traditions in some major universities. Students are now given representation on boards of regents and university councils. Faculty senates have appeared in more universities. Both faculty and students participate in administrative decision-making that previously was denied to them. However, in no major universities have increased faculty and student participation in management reached such proportions as to result in basic changes in university policies. The chief result of changes in governance seems to have been to co-opt student and faculty "politicians" who formerly attacked the administration from outside the "centers of power."

Discussions among the presidents and rectors suggested that in recent years some Latin American universities have begun to act as Corporate Political Actors. These universities seemed to be those that earlier have played a Technocratic role, and with development have assumed greater importance in the political system of the nation. These universities are found in countries with a relatively strong private sector.

The distinction between the University as Critical Conscience and the University as Moral Force appears to turn on the degree to which the university forms part of the society or stands apart from it. The Latin American rectors who favored the concept of University as Critical Conscience appeared to be suggesting that the university's autonomy could be such that it could stand outside society and criticize it while at the same time participating in its development. The rectors seemed to see the university as a community that would through reflection develop a unique vision of society to be implemented through instruction, research and service. The presidents who talked of the U.S. University as Moral Force, on the other hand, did not fix the origin of moral or ideological principles in the life of the university itself. Rather, they argued that the university must seek to re-establish universal moral principles that have been neglected by society.

4 The Authority System in U.S. and Latin American Universities

Two of the sessions of the Conference were specifically dedicated to a discussion of the administrative structure of the university in the U.S. and Latin America. Four presidents of U.S. universities expressed their views on the organization and governance of their institutions. It was clear that there is considerable variation between institutions in terms of structure and levels of participation in decision-making enjoyed by administration, students and faculty. These differences appear to be as large among public institutions as among private universities.

Governance of U.S. Universities

The structure of most U.S. universities includes a board of trustees or regents representing some group outside the university community. In public institutions this is the state government, as there are no federal universities in the United States. Some states have more than one university; each institution may have its own board of trustees or be coordinated by a single statewide board. Private universities also have boards of trustees with legal responsibility for the university, and which often play an active role in its

management. Public boards may be appointed by the state governor; in some cases they are elected. Private university boards are chosen by the sponsoring organization (e.g., a church) or may be self-perpetuating. Faculty, students and alumni may be consulted on the choice of board members, but in virtually no case participate directly in their selection.

The president of the university is generally chosen by the board. Faculty and students may be consulted, and in some instances there are student and faculty trustees, but they do not typically participate directly in the selection of the president of the university. Deans of schools and colleges are generally chosen by the president, often upon consultation with members of the faculty. The chairmen of departments are typically chosen by the deans but in some cases are elected by their fellow faculty members. Student participation in these selections is uncommon.

In summary, although faculty and student participation in university governance has increased in recent years, the hierarchical structure of the U.S. university is much different from the co-government characteristic of the Latin American university. Faculty control is generally limited to nominations of new faculty members (who must be approved by the deans) and of permanent (tenured) professors who must be approved by the president and sometimes by the board of trustees. The faculty does have control over questions of curriculum, which is jealously guarded under the principle of academic freedom. Faculty members sometimes participate in decisions on the admission of students, especially in graduate-level programs.

Student involvement in faculty decision-making is small and usually occurs only because faculty invite students to participate. Some universities have included student representatives in central decision-making bodies such as the board of trustees, but their representation serves more to provide a source of information about students' interests than to give students any significant power. Although interest in governance seemed high during the late 1960's, student pressures for participation appear to have declined.[6]

One of the U.S. presidents felt that U.S. student pressures for participation in university governance reflected the kinds of demands made upon Latin American institutions of higher education after the issuance of the Cordoba Manifesto in 1918. He

saw the major elements of the Manifesto—which in Latin America had touched off a series of university reform movements that have continued until the present—as follows:

1. students should participate in selection of professors
2. permanent tenure should not be offered
3. required courses and attendance should be eliminated
4. university education should be extended to all; universities should admit all applicants who meet minimal requirements (such as graduation from high school)
5. welfare provisions for students should be increased
6. education should be made more relevant to problems of society and youth
7. students should participate fully in all the governing councils of the university
8. education should specifically deal with knowledge obtained through the emotions as well as through reason[7]

Each of these elements appeared in the 1960's in one or more student protests in the United States. Although the content of some of the demands seems more concerned with form than with content of university education, it was argued that the student movement represented a serious questioning of the purposes of the university, and a demand to share in decisions on what those purposes should be.

There was considerable disagreement among the Conference participants as to the degree to which U.S. university students had been directly influenced by the Cordoba Manifesto. There was general consensus, however, that student and faculty pressures for participation in university governance had already declined and were likely to remain low. Three reasons were offered. First, it was suggested that while student movements in the 1960's in Latin America, the U.S., Europe and Japan had pushed for radical social changes, students in the U.S. were motivated more by specific concerns such as the Vietnam War and protection of the environment than by deep-seated ideological convictions. Student movements tend to decline in importance to the extent that U.S. society responds to student concerns and acts to satisfy them (by, for example, ending the Vietnam War and attacking environmental pollution). In Latin America, on the other hand, student movements are rooted in ideologies and seek fundamental changes in

the structure of society rather than solutions to specific social problems.

A second explanation for the decline of student activism in the U.S. was suggested to be the lowering of the voting age to 18 years and the Supreme Court decisions striking down residence requirements for voter registration. Now university students can consider themselves as members of the local political community and act to influence that community. In some cities (e.g., Berkeley, California, and Ann Arbor, Michigan), students and the peripheral campus community have taken control of the local government. The greater focus by the campus community on local and state issues has tended to take politics out of the university itself.

Faculty concern for governance issues may have declined in recent years with the economic depression in higher education[8] threatening job security. In some instances the formation of trade unions among faculty members lessens the legitimacy of their claim to form part of the management of the university. In other instances better salaries and a secure position may be more attractive than sharing the responsibility of management.

Most of the U.S. university presidents felt that the major problem facing their institutions was not internal politicization but rather attempts by state governments to assert increased control over higher education. Public universities feel the pressure most acutely, as state legislatures must approve their annual budget requests and in many recent cases have either rejected requests for additional funding or have demanded that universities more adequately justify their expenditures. In several states the legislature has attempted to regulate the minimal number of hours to be taught by professors during the week, and to deny scholarships to otherwise qualified students who have been involved in political protests.

Nor are private universities completely free of the threat of state control. In those instances in which the government provides funds to the private university, institutions have been required to submit to the same kind of budgetary scrutiny as public institutions. In other states increased spending on public higher education has meant declining enrollments for private institutions and a threat of financial collapse unless some arrangement can be made with the state government.

Governance of Latin American Universities

A variety of arrangements and structures characterize Latin American universities, but some useful generalizations can be made about the respective roles of administrators, faculty and students in university governance. In general the university in Latin America has no external board of trustees or regents. The administrative structure includes the rector and his staff; the university assembly made up of members of the faculty, and in many cases students, alumni, and staff; and the university council. The rector is generally elected by the university assembly for a short period of time, in contrast with U.S. university presidents who are normally appointed for unspecified periods. In the case of church-run universities, the rector may be appointed by ecclesiastical authorities. Rectors may be re-elected, however, and therefore may serve for long periods. The major policy-making group of the university is the council, which in addition to the rector and staff in most cases includes faculty and student representatives elected by the academic units (faculties, schools, institutes) that make up the university.

The governance structure of the university is replicated at the level of the individual faculty, with a dean, faculty assembly, and council. Deans are generally elected by the faculty assembly, with student and staff participation in the process.

In some countries the authority structure of the university lies midway between the model described above and that generally found in the United States, with either a governing board including some persons external to the university, or government control over nominees for central administrative positions in the university. But in almost all Latin American universities, both faculty members and students have significantly more involvement in decision-making for the university than is the case in the United States. And in almost all instances the university is assumed to be autonomous, that is, free of direct control by an external group, whether governmental or private.

Recent university reform movements in Latin America have extended the degree of faculty and student participation obtained as a result of the original Cordoba Movement, and have pressed the university to take a more active role in public affairs of the nation. One of the Conference participants, commenting on differences in

governance structures of universities in Latin America and the U.S., suggested that in the United States the tendency was to see the university as owned by the public, represented in the state, and managed by the university president. In Latin America, he went on, members of the university may not consider the government as a legitimate representative of the people's interests, and may therefore define themselves as "being" (rather than "owning") the university and therefore empowered to make policy for the university.

There was considerable discussion in the Conference on the merits and disadvantages of university autonomy as found in the various Latin American countries. One participant stated that while the Cordoba Movement had been justified as an historical effort to depose the reactionary groups that controlled the university at that time, in many instances autonomy had become the excuse for a social myopia to the real problems of the nation. He argued that more and more Latin American voters were unwilling to tolerate an autonomous university that failed to meet the development needs of the nation. Another participant asserted that autonomy was essential for the university to act as a Critical Conscience for society, but was not useful in orienting the university to meet societal needs.

Another rector observed that higher education in Latin America has been under-financed. As a consequence, universities have failed to meet effectively the technocratic or reproductive function of higher education, not producing the high-level manpower needed for national economic development. Furthermore, under-financing has meant that the growth of the social sciences and humanities has been stunted, and that the universities do not serve effectively as social critics. Instead external groups have intruded in the university and to some extent forced it into a militant posture. He went on to suggest that Latin American universities, like universities in the United States, were subject to intense political pressures, but that these were more frequently at the national rather than the state or local level.

A third rector suggested that the university should be considered not as a scenarium for confrontation but rather as a matrix for socialization into adult roles. He cited data to indicate that in his country students became more conservative the more time they spent in the university. The more the student sees the

university as providing status in the adult society, the more conservative and technically oriented he will be. To the extent that the student's status is guaranteed by the mere fact of graduation from the university (rather than by exercise of competencies acquired) or by social class origins, then the university will not have a socializing effect.

One of the rectors noted in summary that the politicization of the university was a direct reflection of crises in the structure of society itself, rather than a function of university organization. He felt that while the university in times of crisis should not be the bastion of a revolutionary vanguard, neither should it serve to defend the interests of the government even if that government was popularly elected. Instead, the university must strive to maintain the free play of ideas necessary for the society to work through its crisis.

5 The Political Role of the U.S. University

As the discussion progressed, it became clear that the presidents and rectors differed fundamentally in their concept of university politics. One of the participants pointed out that the word "policy" is the same as the word "politics" in Spanish. Policy issues in the Latin American context are almost always fought out in what would be considered (in the U.S.) a partisan fashion, with positions defined by parties or ideologies. Policy analysis in the United States, on the other hand, often is divorced from partisan politics. In principle it relies on rational, pragmatic analyses of objective information. In fact analysis is seldom free from bias, but distortions are not easily explained by reference to common ideologies.

Several of the U.S. presidents argued that the university was often an economic force at the local and state level, but they did not believe the university was, in partisan terms, an important political power. The absence of partisan political power was seen as advantageous in that without power the university president was less likely to be solicited by political groups outside the university. When, however, the university's budget proposal must be approved by politicians in the legislature, political power becomes more important.

The solution to this problem is for the U.S. presidents to appear to "be above" politics, that is, politically neutral, while at the same time actively lobbying on behalf of the university's interests. Many of the presidents agreed that this could be accomplished by recognizing that their proper constituency was not the university community itself, but rather those persons and agencies outside the group that make decisions that affect the university's well-being. The president has some sources of power, in the large budget he manipulates, in the information he can provide, and in admissions. Resources controlled by the university can be exchanged for other resources in a set of relationships that crisscrosses party and ideological lines. In fact, most of the power obtained by the university in exchange relationships comes from business and professional groups rather than from political actors.

The university managed in this fashion might be analagous to a Fifth Estate that, like the press, derives power not from legislated authority but by virtue of its active existence as a member of a corporate society. Under such a conception the university is not structured democratically. One of the presidents commented that the university is not a *polis* anymore than is the press or the church, and for that reason it made sense for the energies of the university president to be directed more toward arrangements with external groups than to be focused on resolution of internal conflicts.

Because the university has relatively little intrinsic power, the success of the president's negotiations and bargaining on the outside depends on his ability to deal with all groups. This in turn requires the appearance of political neutrality. The ideology of academic freedom, which says that the university tolerates all positions within its community but takes no positions as a corporate entity, is seen as essential for the maintenance of the current freedom of action U.S. universities enjoy.

6 The Political Role of the Latin American University

Differences in the political role of universities in the United States and in Latin America may be explained in large measure by differences in the structures of the national political and economic systems of the various countries. The large migrant population and physical size of the United States, coupled with its unprecedented economic growth based for many years on the development of internal markets, contributed to the development of a pluralistic society with tremendous complexity. For many years the university in the United States was of relatively insignificant importance as an institution in the development of the nation. Only in the 20th century did the institution begin to wield some political clout as the university began to take on importance as a supplier of critical information and technology, and as demand for higher education resulted in the emergence of the large public university.

In Latin America, on the other hand, the university's role in society was more important from its inception. The university offered a critical opportunity to socialize the sons of the ruling elites. Governmental centralization and a much closer alliance between the private and public sector resulted in a less differ-

entiated political structure. Control of the university as one of the relatively few institutions in society was critical for political power. In most cases, until the Cordoba Movement, universities were controlled by the State.

The intent behind the Movement was the creation of an independent source of ideas and political power, as much to allow intellectual life to flourish as to provide a haven for dissident politicians. University autonomy—in most countries meaning that the government guarantees the financing of the university and that the university does not have to render accounts—and the sanctity of the university campus and buildings were two of the principal demands that were eventually satisfied in most Latin American countries.

The Issue of Autonomy

The rectors at the Conference did not agree among themselves as to the critical importance of university autonomy. As noted earlier, one felt that the privilege had been abused so often that a development-conscious public would be unwilling to tolerate further irresponsibility by autonomous institutions. Others pointed out that the annual cost of educating a university student was between 10 and 20 times the cost of a student in primary school. Public university education is free in Latin America, but because many low-income persons are deprived of education at the primary or secondary school level, high-cost tuition-free universities are in fact a form of subsidy to the already over-privileged classes.

Those who argued for autonomy made several points. First, the university is more competent than other agencies in society to decide on social ends and the means to reach them because the university collects the best intellects of the nation and provides a setting in which the free discussion of political ideas can lead to solutions for the future. Second, power is much more centralized in Latin America, and it is easier for national governments to take over universities and convert them to their ends. The less complex structure of society in Latin America means that people out of favor with the ruling group have few places in which to work and express themselves outside of the autonomous university.

In general most universities in Latin America have been

financed through the public treasury. In only a few instances has the private sector developed to the point where it could begin to finance higher education, and in only a few instances have universities provided services for which the non-governmental sector is willing to pay. Given a political structure in which most decision-making is made by the central government, which is also the main source of university finance, the university must develop political power *vis a vis* the government in order to maintain its autonomy.

The university develops power either through establishing relationships with political parties, or by achieving sufficient internal unity to directly influence national politics. Many Latin American universities began as loose confederations of autonomous faculties, a tradition that persists today and weakens the rector's authority. To maintain himself in office he must build a coalition among faculties; support from the outside is necessary to provide resources. Rectors eventually are identified with one or another national political faction, and the university itself divides along party lines, with deans and other administrative officers elected according to the balance of partisan supporters in their faculties.

The university's autonomy varies inversely with the power of the central government. To keep that power low, the rector often allies the university with political parties in opposition to the government. In order to achieve some financial autonomy, the university must promote an ideology that justifies its role as an independent actor in society.

In some cases the university rector has attempted to develop a political power base *within* the university because that is his only hope for negotiating the university's position in national politics. In this case, the constituency of the rector is the professors, students and staff of the university rather than external groups. The university is a *polis* in this situation, and one of the major functions of the rector is to organize that political community so that he can use its collective power to defend the university in the halls of government. Teach-ins, strikes, massive public demonstrations and participation in national partisan politics have all been used as attempts by the university to exert influence.

One of the participants described the effort in his university to develop a political structure that would both maintain the

virtue of autonomy—i.e., free discussion of ideas—yet generate enough consensus among members of the university community that the rector could speak with authority when negotiating for financial support. This required the construction of an ideology of pluralism and training in democratic practices, especially respect for the position of minorities and the eschewing of violent solutions.

The attempt failed in this university, as it has in many other universities in the world. It appears that once a university commits itself to being open to society and is seen as a potential weapon in a political struggle, it is likely that external forces will attempt to transform the university to make it serve their interests. This is most likely to happen in small societies or those with a low degree of social complexity, where the university is seen as the single path of upward mobility in the society, and when the society experiences a period of social disorganization or crisis.

How can one expect university autonomy to be protected and yet ask the university to play a vital role in a developing society? In one country the attempt has been made to distinguish clearly the boundaries of the university and the political sphere, and to allow or even encourage complete political activity by professors and students *outside* of the university. Within the university, political topics are proscribed. Some of the rectors and presidents felt that to make such an arrangement the university would have to leave untouched some of the most vital issues in development. In that case the university would fail to use its capacities as a generator of ideas and knowledge essential for development. The participants concluded that no universal answers were available—much depends on the leadership provided by the rector.

7 The Role of the University in Modernization

Discrepancies in opinions between the presidents and rectors with respect to the role of the university can be attributed not solely to cultural and historical factors, but also to different conceptions of the process and objectives of development. Given wide differences in political and economic systems, both in structure and recent performance, it is not surprising that opinions differed as to what the goals of development should be. Countries that have enjoyed political stability and rapid economic growth are likely to believe that they have discovered the best approach to modernization. Other countries in political turmoil and economic chaos, having followed the same basic set of policies, are likely to end by rejecting those policies out of hand.

Some Latin American rectors and U.S. presidents think that development can best be achieved through a process that emphasizes increased productivity. The preferred policy is the encouragement of heavy industry and mechanized agriculture, the development strategies that seem to have worked well for both the rich capitalist countries and the Socialist bloc. The role of the university is to train the high-level manpower needed to run the modern or productive sector of the economy. This sector is

relatively small, and requires disproportionately heavy investments and economic incentives, but the resultant increase in gross national product is considered worth the inequalities and social disruptions produced.

Other rectors and presidents disagreed with this strategy, arguing that the ensuing social costs were too great and the tangible rewards for the society as a whole too few. It was argued that around the world developmentalism has resulted in pollution of the environment, aggravation of problems of equality both within and between nations, and increased alienation of man from the fundamental purposes of existence. True development is more likely to occur through policies that involve all of the populace in the task of building a new society, in which goals of production and productivity are always seen as instrumental and secondary to goals of human development. In many countries in Latin America the fundamental social problems are the distribution of wealth, and the creation of the means by which all citizens can begin to realize their human potential.

Given such a definition of development, the role of the university changes from that of training the elites who will reproduce the existing social structure to education that serves to reduce social differentiation. Such a task requires a vision of a new society, or at least a set of criteria by which political leaders can evaluate current performance. The university is ideally suited to serve as the source of this vision or criteria for critical analysis. and to help political leaders to develop processes by which the nation can move itself in harmony toward a more perfect union.

Most of the discussion described above took place between the Latin American rectors. Those U.S. presidents with experience in Latin America tended to espouse the second conception more than the first, but that may be because their experience had been in countries where "big push" industrialization efforts had not been highly successful.

A parallel discussion took place, however, among the U.S. presidents, with respect to the role of the university in national affairs in the United States. Here the concern was with the extent to which the university should attempt to redress the inequalities that characterize the U.S. social structure through special attention to the education and employment of women and members of minority groups.

Much of the discussion turned on the historical role of the university in the political and economic development of the rich countries. Some of the participants pointed out that major 19th century achievements in industrialization and democracy were made before universities had any major significance in the United States. Others noted that many of the early 20th century innovations in university education that contributed to further economic growth and political development were imposed on the university by politicians over the resistance of educators.

There was final agreement, however, that whether the university generates changes in society or merely reacts to or reflects them, higher education today has a vital role in the definition of objectives for a society, and the evaluation of methods and techniques and structures to achieve those objectives. The university's impact on goals comes chiefly through the elaboration of alternatives to correct social, economic, and political forms and procedures. Governments necessarily have short-run perspectives; they are likely to choose development strategies and projects more on the basis of immediate political gains than long-term consequences. In contrast, the university can take a long-range perspective and develop projections of what the country's future might be made to be.

The participants found it difficult to specify the relative amount of attention that universities should give to instructional, research and extension activities that continue the present social order, as opposed to the development of new ideas and techniques for an emerging consciousness. There was agreement that in all cases a portion of the university's resources must be allocated to reproductive activities, and that in all cases the university must jealously guard its right and exercise its ability to call the nation's attention to other criteria and activities than those promoted by the government. Finally, there was agreement that error in the assessment of the proper balance would be minimized to the extent that the university maintained close contact with the society it serves.

Although a few examples of high university sensitivity to social needs were described, no agreement was reached on structural mechanisms for keeping the university in touch with its clients. The possibilities discussed included contracts between the university and groups in society, and "permanent education" as a

means of bringing new populations into the university. U.S. universities have had extensive experience with the former and in general find it useful. The university president must be careful that in tying the institution to external groups he does not undermine the university's autonomy. Several countries in Latin America are now experimenting with the "Open University" concept and will soon be in a position to exchange experiences with U.S. universities.

The Latin American rectors were unanimous, however, in rejecting a concept of development in which the steps to be taken to guarantee progress could be identified in the history of the economically advanced nations. Even those favoring development through rapid industrialization and capital-intensive agriculture argued that solutions for their countries must be determined locally and could not be transplanted from other nations.

Developmental determinism was rejected for several reasons. First, because the poor countries of the world, to the extent that they envy the material possessions of the rich countries, would like to acquire them without repeating the mistakes made by the more advanced nations. Second, national pride dictates a belief that there must be a unique national way to achieve development, that somehow cultural forms must be stamped on whatever is done. Finally, Latin American governments and political parties are highly concerned about the extent to which development theories and strategies conceived by experts from the rich countries assign the poor countries to positions of perpetual dependence.

The memory of the frustrations of the Alliance for Progress was still fresh in the minds of the Conference participants, who saw many difficulties in the transfer of technologies from one nation to another. Economic and political arrangements are effective only to the extent that they mesh with the structure of other sectors in society. Solutions for development that worked extremely well in a sending culture are, perhaps because of their former success, less likely to do well in the recipient culture.

For example, consider the importation of a new technology for the processing of a basic agricultural product. The technology requires new kinds of technicians, new administrative arrangements, and eventually, different pay scales that disturb existing patterns. Managers of the processing plant put new demands on

farmers with respect to the varieties of the product, impose new schedules and may disrupt traditional links with the market. Large-scale innovations may lead to political disturbances and affect basic national values. The more complex the technology, the less it can be questioned by national leaders, the more it requires external assistance, and the more it breeds dependence on the supplying economy. All this is likely if the process works. If there is resistance to the innovation, as is often the case, the innovation fails and dependency is avoided but at the cost of foregone opportunity and considerable investment.

Some of the problems of technology transfer have been experienced in Latin American universities. During the past two decades a number of "innovations" from U.S. universities (many of which have now been abandoned in the U.S.) were exported to Latin America under the aegis of bilateral assistance agencies. Latin American universities were told that in order to modernize they should attempt to match structural and operational features of leading universities in the United States. Recommendations were made with respect to the type and amount of equipment to purchase. Universities were told they needed vastly expanded libraries. Emphasis was placed on the importance of having a faculty composed of full-time professors who do research and on the advantages of the departmental structure over traditional faculties. Several Latin American universities adopted the general studies model. One university was organized along the same principles as the U.S. land-grant college. Many universities began their own graduate-level programs, and one or two countries experimented with two-year colleges.

The result was much change in university operation and structure. It is not clear, however, whether the universities are in any better position to serve the societies in which they exist. One of the Latin American participants referred to the "dynamic immobilization" of the Latin American university, and listed three major areas in which the promise of university reform had been unfulfilled. First, he felt that there is little evidence to suggest that Latin American universities do any better today at providing the manpower and ideas needed by their societies. (They are, however, more responsive to those needs than was previously the case.) Second, it is not clear that university education meets individual expectations; several countries have large numbers of unemployed

university graduates and in all the economies there appears to be much underemployment in the use of professionals in non-professional positions. Finally, the expansion of university education has in many cases served to aggravate already severe problems of social and economic inequality. The modernization of the university without modernization of the rest of the society can create tremendous social gaps and economic pressures that further impoverish the majority of the population and contribute to internal inflationary pressures. Rectors at the Conference suggested that the experiences of the last decade pointed to the need to rethink the role of the university. Although more important perhaps than earlier, its contribution would not be achieved by simple administrative reforms.

Three kinds of explanations were offered as to why structural and curricular innovations imported from the United States have failed to mobilize the university in relation to society. First, none of the changes significantly affected the capacity of the university to act in society. Internal reforms and "modernizations" did nothing to enhance the political power of the rector of the university, and therefore could not change the balance of forces in society. This explanation fits with the conception of the university as Militant or Corporate Political Actor.

A similar analysis suggests that arrangements brought from another culture are not always a help to the university in developing a critical vision of society. On the contrary, emphasis on empirical research and technocratic manpower training may in some instances act to weaken those forces within the university that could have increased the university's prominence as a Critical Conscience. Statements of this kind must be qualified, however, by the recognition that although importation of foreign cultural and technical models may have negative short-run consequences, these "failures" also facilitate the process of major long-range social change.

Some critics suggest that Latin American universities are in all but a few instances "kept" institutions that serve the ruling elites, and that any technical improvements in the administration and curriculum of the university only serve to enhance the position of the university's keeper. This opinion was not shared by the majority of the university presidents and rectors who felt that even though these universities were not as strong as would be

desirable, most had sufficient autonomy to make an impact as a Critical Conscience on society.

Some Conference participants felt that university innovations imported from the United States had not only failed to significantly improve the university's contribution to society but in some instances had debilitated the institution. The notion of the university campus, for example, as a means of building the academic community, in several instances in Latin America had served only to further remove the university from contact with society, and to encourage development of a youth culture antagonistic to major social and economic objectives. (At the same time, however, the "withdrawal" of the university to a central campus may be essential to the development of institutional coherence and increased impact on society.) The imposition of the full-time professor meant that teachers no longer had as much contact with developments in their field outside the university, and moreover suffered a decline in income. Graduate studies in the United States in order to improve the quality of instruction in the Latin American universities in some cases resulted in overtraining in research and theory that had little application or feasibility in Latin America, or in valuable human resources remaining in the United States. (But "overtraining" can also result in upgrading of research and instruction.) Departmentalization in some cases resulted in intensification of professional rivalries and a reduction of communication among faculty members. The participants agreed that modernization by means of technology importation was a risky business at best, and that real gains in higher education would require a much more careful process of interchange between institutions.

8 Mutual Cooperation in International Development

Whatever their conceptions of development, the Latin American participants in the Conference agreed that the problems of development override country boundaries, and that sub-optimal solutions at the national level would be detrimental in the long run. While large countries such as Brazil, Argentina and Mexico might develop self-sufficiency, the smaller countries cannot, and all countries would benefit from a total systems approach to their joint development.

Mutual Cooperation in Latin America

The paper presented by Reynold Carlson provided information about the Andean Group effort at regional economic integration and the special contribution to be made by universities. As Dr. Carlson pointed out, much would depend on the quality of human resources provided by universities. Even more important, universities have to assist in the development of political leaders' consciousness of the need for regional integration and commitment to the reduction of excessive national pride that impedes such efforts.

Educational integration is covered under the Andres Bello Agreement of the Andean Pact. Projects underway include development of a regional educational television facility and planning for a regional graduate-level program in business administration and public sector management. Technicians for the television project and faculty for the graduate school are being recruited from various Latin American countries. There was general agreement that more of these kinds of activities were needed in order to overcome the serious problem of lack of information held by Latin American universities about their counterparts in neighboring countries. One participant observed that no university has a center of Latin American studies, nor have the concerns of economic integration, such as the Andean Pact, had any discernible impact on the programs of curriculum of the universities. Some of the Conference members felt that there was more sharing of students and faculty between the U.S. and Latin America than within the various Latin American countries. The argument was made that Latin American universities could contribute little to development of their own countries and the rest of the region until they had oriented their instruction and research toward a fuller understanding of the geo-political system of which their nations are a part.

While not enough has been done with respect to exchange of information among Latin American universities, several outstanding efforts have begun in recent years. For example, 20 economic research institutions in Latin American universities have combined with the Brookings Institution under the title of Joint Studies on Latin American Economic Integration (ECIEL) to provide basic data about the structure and operation of the various economies and their problems. Programs in social science have been organized into a coordinating agency (CLACSO) similar in structure to the Social Science Research Council in the United States. The Central American Higher Education Council (CSUCA) has been performing high-level manpower analyses for the five Central American nations for about ten years.

Regional planning in both economics and health has been promoted by the Latin American Institute of Economics and Health Planning (ILPES) which provides training programs for Latin American professionals. Eight educational research centers have banded together in a loose confederation that circulates

information about research activities and plans. Information about developments in education and educational research have been facilitated greatly by the regular publication of an excellent journal of research (by the Centro de Estudios Educativos in Mexico) and of abstracts of documents in education (by the Centro de Investigacion y Desarrolo de la Educacion in Santiago, Chile). The Organization of American States has recently published a bibliography of basic books in the social sciences published in Latin America.

Several universities have begun programs to examine cultural and philosophic bases for Latin American integration. Other instances of efforts to provide communication between universities in Latin America were cited at the Conference, and the participants agreed that they had not been familiar even with the few sources of information currently available.

With respect to the exchange of professors and students among universities, several rectors commented that they had large numbers of students from other countries in their institutions. Table 2 presents data on the number of foreign students enrolled in universities in the USSR, Northern America (U.S. and Canada), Europe and Latin America for 1960, 1965 and 1970.

TABLE 2

Foreign Student Enrollments in Various Regions*

	1960		*1965*		*1970*	
	Number	*% of Total*	*Number*	*% of Total*	*Number*	*% of Total*
USSR	14,000	0.6	16,200	0.4	17,400	0.4
Northern America	60,358	1.6	93,998	1.6	166,971	1.8
Europe	105,742	5.1	148,513	4.7	184,136	4.0
Latin America	12,534	2.2	18,773	2.1	20,341	1.3

*Foreign students are defined as those not citizens of the country in which they are studying.

Source: United Nations Statistical Yearbook, 1972.

As can be seen, Latin American universities enroll proportionately fewer students from other countries than do universities in Europe or the United States. This is not just a function of space, as total enrollments in Latin American universities have increased rapidly in the past ten years, but as the table shows, opportunities or incentives for foreign students have not kept pace with the growth of universities. It should also be noted that 12 of the 20 thousand foreign students in Latin America are enrolled in Argentine universities. One of the Conference participants observed that study in another country was usually motived more by lower costs than by desire to learn about another culture; study in another Latin American university is seldom a result of an organized program of exchange between universities. (Factors such as availability of or access to desirable degree programs, e.g., medicine, also are important in attracting students from other countries.)

Exchanges of professors are similarly more a result of accidental factors than of planned exchange. Most Latin American university professors teaching outside their home country would have remained at home if political or economic circumstances had been favorable. The Conference participants agreed that it would be important to rationalize exchange programs in the future, and that this would require making greater use of the directories of university professors and researchers maintained by agencies such as the Institute of International Education.

Mutual Cooperation Between the U.S. and Latin America

Concern was expressed in regard to the need for increased exchange between universities in the U.S. and Latin America. Conference participants were less worried about exchange of students (except in terms of its contribution to the "brain drain" from Latin America to the United States) than about the need to exchange professors and provide opportunities for university administrators to become familiar with activities and problems of other institutions. At the moment there is much more flow of U.S. professors to Latin America than Latin American professors to U.S. universities as staff members. To some extent this is a function of U.S. universities' lack of knowledge of the availability and skills of Latin American professors, and to the absence of structural arrangements in Latin American universities guarantee-

ing the re-entry of professors who have taken leave.

Some U.S. presidents felt that problems of understanding between the U.S. and Latin America could be alleviated to a degree by the establishment of centers for U.S. Studies in Latin American universities. At the moment no such center exists, although there are centers for European, Middle Eastern, Asian and African Studies. Some presidents argued that U.S. Studies centers could make an important contribution to hemispheric relationships.

The rectors did not agree. A number felt that the extent of North American domination of the economies and foreign policies of Latin American countries was so great that all studies of economics and political science were necessarily oriented toward the United States. Others pointed to the massive U.S. cultural presence in Latin America in the form of U.S. business, mass media and consumer products, arguing that in many cases countries knew less about what was going on in the neighboring nation than they knew about the United States. There seemed to be agreement that if an Institute for U.S. Studies were to be created, it would be important that it emerge as an initiative of a Latin American university, so as to be completely free of U.S. influence.

Concern was expressed by the rectors and several U.S. presidents that whatever steps were taken to increase communication between universities should not unwittingly increase what was considered to be an already excessive cultural dependence on the United States by most Latin American countries. Cultural exchanges would be likely to yield most benefit for all involved when each party spoke from a position of autochthonous development.

Mutual Cooperation in a World System

Agreement was reached that the problems facing Latin America and the U.S. were now world problems, that development could best be understood in terms of a *world* system rather than in terms of bilateral relationships among the Americas. Therefore the role of the university should be discussed in terms of its contribution to international development. The information a university needs to organize its research and instructional activities must cover all areas of the globe. Its curriculum must deal not only with

problems of national identity, but also with the need to foster an increased consciousness of international development problems and priorities.

A proposal for a transnational curriculum which was addressed to the presidents of the U.S. universities also found a sympathetic audience among the Latin American rectors. It was suggested that a large task remains to be accomplished by almost all universities in developing a truly universal curriculum. The concept of the universal curriculum was not intended as advocacy of an exhaustive survey or selective sampling of all cultures, but rather of a curriculum which selects its subject matter impartially from the products of all major cultures in accordance with the principle of the best. There are obvious obstacles to the development of such a transnational approach to university education. However, the presidents and rectors believed that there is a persuasive case to be made for its value in extending the substance and scope of education in the developing global system.

One might note that, although there is a long history of relationships between the U.S. and Latin America, the various parties have ties with a number of other countries and cultures. Bilateral programs that ignore those other relationships are likely to founder. It was argued that the discussion of exchange will continue to be confused until universities decide whether they are going to be international or parochial. This decision would require a university commitment, including investment of its own resources, to the development of programs to produce faculties and build student bodies capable of living and working in the emerging world system.

Only by means of dialogue among equals could the universities of the Americas develop a truly international orientation. The basis for that dialogue is increased recognition and appreciaton of the unique features of institutions of higher education in the various republics.

9 Conference Recommendations

The recommendations which emerged from the conference discussions tended to fall into three categories:

I. Technical Assistance Through Educational Exchange.

Considerable emphasis was placed on the need to design student and faculty exchange programs in such a way as to meet the felt needs of Latin American institutions. For example, it was noted that in Venezuela assistance is required in strengthening middle-level technical training programs, both by providing opportunities for study outside of the country and by sending specialists into Venezuela to help with curricular planning and the training of teachers. Fields mentioned in which such assistance would be helpful included urban planning, resource management, development administration, and petroleum, chemical, and electrical engineering.

II. Improved Inter-American Communication.

Several participants called attention to the need for an expanded program of workshops and seminars on the relationship

between higher education and development involving academic administrators, scholars and government officials from the United States and Latin America. Some Latin American participants expressed dissatisfaction with the response of higher education institutions throughout the Americas to the development challenge in Latin America and emphasized that experimentation with different models of higher education is required if this challenge is to be met successfully. Non-formal and continuing education programs such as the extension courses offered for Bolivian tin miners in science and technology and programs in basic literacy for factory workers in Venezuela represent promising innovations which merit critical examination.

III. Latin American Integration.

Several participants remarked on the paucity of institutional opportunities for Latin Americans to undertake critical studies of the forces leading toward unity and cooperation among the Latin American nations. Relatively few academic programs exist in Latin America which focus on the philosophy, objectives and mechanisms for regional and hemispheric integration. In this connection it was suggested that a seminar would serve the useful purpose of focusing attention on this need and developing a strategy for meeting the need.

* * *

The Institute of International Education is highly interested in opportunities for useful service to the Latin American nations in the development of higher education, and is actively pursuing discussions in regard to potential projects begun at the Caracas Conference. Although the major purpose of CHEAR will continue to be that of providing a vehicle for a frank and open exchange between educational leaders in Latin America and the United States, we believe that the CHEAR meetings can also play a seminal role in generating programs that will contribute significantly to meeting educational needs.

The majority of the university heads present at Caracas strongly supported the view that programs of educational exchange and assistance are useful to the degree that they truly represent mutual needs as identified by both Latin American nations and the United States. IIE finds the CHEAR conferences

invaluable in their contribution to insight into Latin American education at the policy-making level. In an effort to complement CHEAR in strengthening IIE's rapport with Latin American higher education, the Institute has recently expanded its activities in these countries.

IIE is in the process of establishing a new office in Mexico City which joins the Institute's existing Lima office in working with educators, students and other individuals and agencies concerned with education.

IIE has also established the Office of the South American Area Director—a new concept in which a senior representative of the Institute will travel extensively in Latin America and the United States with the responsibility of strengthening the ties between U.S. and Latin American education. The Director will significantly add to IIE's capacity to respond effectively to opportunities for service, providing a direct point of contact between the university in the U.S. and in Latin America and a means of implementing new relationships in useful directions.

The Institute shares the view expressed by the Latin American rectors that the success of programs of exchange and assistance depends upon a realistic appraisal of the needs and capacities of higher education in both halves of the hemisphere as identified on the scene, and believes that the South American Area Director can make a valuable contribution to the achievement of this end. IIE is grateful for the support for this effort extended by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State. The Institute will continue to seek means of serving both national needs and the needs of the inter-American community through our role as a builder of bridges in international education.

Footnotes

[1] See Philip G. Altbach, *Higher Education in Developing Countries: A Select Bibliography*, Harvard University, Center for International Affairs, Occasional Paper No. 24, April 1970, for the most complete listing of works on higher education in Latin America in Spanish, Portuguese and English.

[2] For bibliography of U.S. higher education the best single source is Lewis B. Mayhew, *The Literature of Higher Education*, published annually by Jossey-Bass in San Francisco.

[3] See Harold R. W. Benjamin, *Higher Education in the American Republics*, McGraw-Hill, 1965, for a description of the structure of universities in the 21 republics. This book has been translated into Spanish.

[4] One version of Ribeiro's work is *La Universidad Latinoamericana*, Editorial Universitaria Santiago, Chile, 1971. A sample of Medina's work is found in Jose Medina Echevarria, *Filosofia, Educacion y Desarrollo*, Mexico, Siglo XXI, 1967. A third perspective is provided in Alfonso Ocampo Londoño, *Higher Education in Latin America: Current and Future*, New York: International Council for Educational Development, Occasional Paper No. 7, 1973.

[5] See Luis Scherz, *El Camino de la Revolucion Universitaria*, Editorial del Pacifico, Santiago, Chile, 1968. An excellent statement of models of the univerity is by Jorge Graciarena, "Los procesos de reforma universitaria y el cambio social en America Latina," in *La Universidad Latinoamericana: Enfoques Tipologicos*, Corporacion de Promocion Universitaria, Santiago, Chile, 1972.

[6] Participants in the Conference several times cited the following work as suggesting new directions in the development of university autonomy in the United States: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *The Capitol and the Campus: State Responsibility for Secondary Education*, McGraw-Hill, 1971. For one view of solutions to problems of internal political structure, see Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *The Governance of Higher Education*, McGraw-Hill, 1972.

[7] The actual set of demands made in the Cordoba Manifesto was longer. Also, as will be discussed later, the movement was intended principally to throw off government intervention in university affairs; it was an attack on the government rather than on the university.

[8] The financial woes of higher education in the U.S. are described in Earl J. Cheit's *The New Depression in Higher Education*, McGraw-Hill, 1971.

In 1958, the Institute of International Education with financial assistance from the Carnegie Corporation of New York established the Council on Higher Education in the American Republics (CHEAR) to promote a dialogue among university presidents in the Americas. Since then, CHEAR funding has come from several sources, including the Ford Foundation, the Inter-American Development Bank, and, most recently, the Tinker Foundation of New York. During the late 1960s programs based on the CHEAR model were begun in Canada, Europe, Africa and Asia. In 1970, the International Councils on Higher Education (ICHE) was established as a division of IIE to provide an organizational framework for the several regional councils. Discussions are now underway with Arab educators to design a council for the Arab Middle East.